all over the book. One's impression after a reading is that it is mostly geography. This is true in point of pages, of detail given, and from the fact that most of the history correlated is that of territorial occupation, of migration, and of settlement. In only one chapter does he get into "pure" history: the chapter on the Civil War. The treatment of the taking of Vicksburg, the battles around Chattanooga, and the campaigns in the Shenandoah is fine, if for no other reason than that it illustrates the method by which the organic relationship between geography and "pure" history may be investigated and investigated interestingly. This chapter is of interest for the further reason that here is shown more clearly than elsewhere the art of judicious selection of material. Any work that deals with the relations of two correlates should treat every element of one so that its correlation with an element in the other will be affirmed or denied; yet in many places — *e. g.*, pp. 53-58, 76-86, and in the chapter on "The Prairie Country — a good deal of material is introduced which is not correlated to any term on the other side. There is an attempt made to paint the geographic picture too wide and too continuous for the space at hand.

The judicious selection of good illustrations is pleasingly in contrast to the common extravagant use of illustrations without regard to their appropriateness. All the maps are important for the elucidation of the text though some of them — *e. g.*, the maps of the northern Appalachians and Chattanooga — are too meagerly marked to serve as a reference for all the matter given.

These criticisms aside, the work has the right ring. The spirit is good, the style is popular and withall highly suggestive. For a teacher Professor Brigham's work possesses more than ordinary value, both because of the matter given and because it illustrates how by this method the investigation of the organic relationship of geography to history can be clothed in attractive garb and pushed beyond the stages of relationship more obviously organic into the more specialized forms of each.

WERRETT WALLACE CHARTERS.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO,
Graduate Schools.

Genetic Psychology for Teachers. By CHARLES HUBBARD JUDD, PH.D. ("International Education Series,") New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1903. Pp. xii, 329.

THIS book has apparently grown out of the author's "experiences of a number of years spent in teaching phychology to classes of teachers." It has the advantage of being in close touch with some of the more pressing and practical problems of elementary-school teaching, as these problems appear from the standpoint of one not directly engaged in the work of such teaching. "Racial and Individual Development in Writing," "The Process of Reading," "The Idea of Number," are chapter headings in the latter part of the book, and represent the application of genetic psychology to the traditional three R's.

What might fairly be called the controlling idea of the book is the idea that genetic psychology properly begins, like charity, at home; that is, with the study of the development of one's own mental processes. Genetic psychology has too often been narrowly conceived as a study of the infant mind, as child-study, as

the analysis of the growth of some other mind. Dr. Judd would have it clearly understood by teachers that their minds, too, have not necessarily ceased to grow, and that there are distinct advantages in watching the unfolding of some mental process at first hand. One of the chief advantages of this introspective genetic psychology is that it affords a basis for studying mental growth wherever found, in the minds of children, as well as in one's own. "Teacher-Study," the special theme of the introductory chapter, is as important for education as "child-study;" in fact it is a prerequisite to "child-study."

The author has ranged far and near for illustrative material to reinforce this idea. Results obtained in the laboratory study of illusions have been turned to account, for example, to show that even such apparently fixed and objective mental experiences as our perceptions of space relationships are susceptible to further development in some instances, which can be studied to some degree at first hand by the nontechnical observer. There is also a chapter devoted to a psychological analysis of the teacher's writing habit — an analysis which can hardly fail to give the teacher of writing a more intelligent and sympathetic appreciation of what probably goes on in the experience of a child learning to write. In the chapter on "Racial and Individual Development in Writing" interesting historical material has been brought together to illustrate the evolution of written symbols. Without directly attacking any system of penmanship or line of copy-books, Dr. Judd has done much both in the psychological and in the historical discussion toward emancipating the teacher from the dogmatism of special methods that tend to sacrifice individuality to a copper-plate uniformity. Individuality in penmanship it is desirable to train, so I understand the argument to run, as well as individuality in other forms of expression. Legibility and fluency are, of course, the main desiderata in this form of expression. But the ways of reaching these ends lie along the paths of individual habits. "Every child should be allowed to sit and hold his pen and paper and move his hand in the way best suited to develop his own individual mode of action" (p. 228). It should hardly be necessary to add that such an opportunity to develop individual mode of action is not a sort of pedagogical *laissez-faire*. "Every child is an individual problem to the teacher." "Individual training means a careful study of individual needs, and a suggestive, helpful guidance on the part of the teacher."

It was the part of good pedagogy for the author to direct his psychological analyses and applications to the subjects in which most of his auditors were principally engaged — the teaching of reading, writing, and arithmetic. It is doubtless well also for those who are teaching in other branches — geography, manual training, natural science, the arts — to be so clearly and forcibly reminded that the three R's have a good deal of educational significance, after all, from the standpoint of genetic psychology. But the book suffers in some respects from its own restrictions of outlook. It seems to see little value in constructive work, in manual training, in laboratory work, save as attempted short-cuts to the present values and meanings of things, superseding the roundabout, but richer and more cultivating, paths of memory and reflection.

"One can avoid memory work through training in the use of things. This is the observation which experience forces upon us at all points, and this is the principle that our modern education is so eagerly taking up in all departments — in the kindergarten, in the constructive work of the elementary schools, in

manual training, and in the laboratory work of our high schools and colleges. Learn by use, learn by doing, and you shall have followed the shortest route to recognition of present, practical meanings." (P. 62.)

One might be willing to entertain such a view as this as an indictment of mechanical, external, unpsychological methods of teaching constructive work, manual training, and laboratory science. But are we to understand that these forms of school work simply represent lines of least resistance, in the Spencerian sense? Spencer would be made to support some of his own arguments for scientific education in a rather curious way. Undoubtedly students could be found who have drifted into such courses out of mental inertia. But students could also be found who have continued in the study of literature, or history, say, because these subjects seemed to afford the lines of least resistance.

The term "memory" is used, as the discussion in the context of the paragraph quoted would indicate, in the sense of reflection, of revision, not in the sense of an almost sheer repetition of a past experience. I have been unable to see that constructive work, manual training, laboratory work in science, do not give rise to difficulties, problems, and projects which call into play the powers of memory, of reflection, at least as often as the three R's give rise to opportunities for fixing mechanical habits of learning by use, by doing. To associate memory, however defined, with any particular form of discipline, or to dissociate it from constructive and experimental activities, is to out-faculty the faculty psychology.

W. C. GORE.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.